

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/666,701	10/666,701 09/19/2003 Chien-Min Sung		T8908.DIV	2841	
7590 02/25/2005			EXAMINER		
THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP			MORGAN, EILEEN P		
P.O. Box 1219			, prinur	DA DED MUADED	
Sandy, UT 84091-1219			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2722		

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/666,70		SUNG, CHIEN-MIN				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
	•	Eileen P M	organ	3723				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a		_					
Period fo		ppears on are						
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repoper of the provisions of the provisions of the provisions of the provision of the	I. 1.136(a). In no eve eply within the statu d will apply and will ute, cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19	September 2	<u>003</u> .	•				
•	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□								
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>21-39 and 41-53</u> is/are pending in the	he application						
•/=	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)⊠	Claim(s) <u>21-39</u> is/are allowed.							
•	Claim(s) <u>41-53</u> is/are rejected.							
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
•	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to: ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers							
ا ا ۵	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.						
•—	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
10/	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
111	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
•								
•	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 								
	application from the International Bure	au (PCT Rule	: 17.2(a)).					
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certif	ied copies not receive	d				
Attachmer	at(s)							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
- —	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 er No(s)/Mail Date	98)	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/666,701

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

 A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
 - (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 41,43, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin-5,776,355.

Martin discloses a diamond tool having CVD diamond on the tool with a working surface and an opposite growth surface (col. 2, line 41), wherein the tool can be made with a mold (col. 3, line 50), wherein a non-diamond layer (col. 3, line 23) is formed against the diamond layer.

3. Claims 41, 42, 44,45,53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pryor -5,130,111.

Pryor discloses a CVD diamond tool (col. 6, last line) in which a mold having convex and concave surfaces are used to form a diamond surface and growth surface, and wherein the diamond is attached to non-diamond surfaces such as metal or plastic.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 42,44-50, 52, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, alone.
 - In regard to the surface roughness, surface shape and diamond thickness, this would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at time invention was made dependent on workpiece and in order to achieve desired results. In regard to the use of the tool, (die, dresser, etc.) this would have been an obvious choice since diamond tools are well known for their use in these operations.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,701

Art Unit: 3723

6. Claims 43, 46-52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor, alone.

In regard to the surface roughness, this would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at time invention was made dependent on workpiece and in order to achieve desired results. In regard to the use of the tool, (die, dresser, etc.) this would have been an obvious choice since diamond tools are well known for their use in these operations.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 21-39 appear allowable over the prior art of record.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eileen P Morgan whose telephone number is 571.272.4488. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday (Office), Friday (Work at home).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571.272.4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/666,701

Art Unit: 3723

EΜ

February 18, 2005

EILEEN P. MORGAN PRIMARY EXAMINER